



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

ck

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/530,083	06/03/2005	Moon-Hee Sung	4240-119	9007
23448	7590	12/10/2007		
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY / TECHNOLOGY LAW				
PO BOX 14329				
RESEARCH TRIANGLE PARK, NC 27709				
			EXAMINER	
			NAVARRO, ALBERT MARK	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1645	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/10/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/530,083

Applicant(s)

SUNG ET AL.

Examiner

Mark Navarro

Art Unit

1645

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 November 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3,4,7-12,14-16 and 18-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4,7-12,14-16 and 18-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4/1/05</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election without traverse of Group I, species B; Group II, species B, Group III, species B; and Group IV, species B in the reply filed on November 13, 2007 is acknowledged.

Claims 2, 5-6, 13, and 17 have been cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-4, 7-12, 14-16 and 18-23 are pending in the instant application.

Claim Objections

1. Claim 14 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Where possible, claims are to be complete in themselves. Reference to a specific figure or table "is permitted only in exceptional circumstances where there is no practical way to define the invention in words and where it is more concise to incorporate by reference than duplicating a drawing or table into the claim. Incorporation by reference is a necessity doctrine, not for applicant's convenience." Ex parte Fressola, 27 USPQ2d 1608, 1609 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1993) (citations omitted).

See MPEP § 608.01(m)

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. Claims 9-12, and 19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as

to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. This is a written description rejection.

Claims 9-12, and 19-23 recite crude antigen proteins extract from said microbes or antigen proteins purified from said microbes.”

The specification and claims do not indicate what distinguishing attributes are shared by the members of the genus. Thus, the scope of the claims includes numerous structural variants, and the genus is highly variant because a significant number of structural differences between genus members is permitted. Since the disclosure fails to describe the common attributes or characteristics that identify members of the genus, and because the genus is highly variant, “crude antigen proteins extract/antigen proteins purified from microbes” alone is insufficient to describe the genus. One of skill in the art would reasonably conclude that the disclosure fails to provide a representative number of species to describe the genus. Thus, applicant was not in possession of the claimed genus.

Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention and a reference to a potential method of isolating it. The protein itself is required. See *Fiers v. Revel*, 25 USPQ 2d 1601 at 1606 (CAFC 1993) and *Amgen Inc. V. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co. Ltd.*, 18 USPQ2d 1016.

Vas-Cath Inc. V. Mahurkar, 19 USPQ2d 111, clearly states that “applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought,

he or she was in possession of the invention. The invention is, for purposes of the 'written description' inquiry, whatever is now claimed." The specification does not "clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed."

Applicant is reminded that Vas-Cath make clear that the written description provision of 35 USC 112 is severable from its enablement provision.

Furthermore, in *The Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly* (43 USPQ2d 1398-1412), the court held that a generic statement which defines a genus by only their functional activity does not provide an adequate written description of the genus. The court indicated that while Applicants are not required to disclose every species encompassed by a genus, the description of a genus is achieved by the recitation of a representative number of DNA molecules, usually defined by a nucleotide sequence, falling within the scope of the claimed genus. At section B(1), the court states that "An adequate written description of a DNA... requires a precise definition, such as by structure, formula, chemical name, or physical properties, not a mere wish or plan for obtaining the claimed chemical invention."

Applicants are directed to the Revised Interim Guidelines for the Examination of Patent Applications Under the 35 U.S.C. 112, 1 "Written Description" Requirement, Federal Register, Vol. 64, No. 244, pages 71427-71440, Tuesday December 21, 1999.

3. Claims 1, 4, 7-12, 19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for immunogenic compositions, does

not reasonably provide enablement for vaccine compositions. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Facts that should be considered in determining whether a specification is enabling, or if it would require an undue amount of experimentation to practice the invention include: (1) the quantity of experimentation necessary to practice the invention, (2) the amount of direction or guidance presented, (3) the presence or absence of working examples, (4) the nature of the invention, (5) the state of the prior art, (6) the relative skill of those in the art, (7) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, and (8) the breadth of the claims. See In re Wands, 858 F.2d 731,737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1403 (Fed. Cir. 1988). The Federal Circuit has noted, however, that only those factors that are relevant based on the facts need to be addressed. See Enzo Biochem, Inc. v. Calgene, Inc. 188 F.3d 1362, 1371, 52 USPQ2d 1129, 1135 (Fed. Cir 1999).

First, as set forth by Plotkin et al (VACCINES W.B. Saunders Company, 1988, page 571) "The key to the problem (of vaccine development) is the identification of that protein component of a virus or microbial pathogen that itself can elicit the production of protective antibodies... and thus protect the host against attack by the pathogen." This teaching directly addresses factors 1, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8.

A vaccine "must by definition trigger an immunoprotective response in the host vaccinated; mere antigenic response is not enough." In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1557,1561, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Given the lack of guidance, and the unpredictable nature of the invention, one of skill in the art would be forced into excessive experimentation in order to practice the instantly claimed invention.

It is noted that this rejection has not been applied to claim 3, as HPV E6 and E7 antigens are recognized as antigens which can elicit a protective immune response. However, the broad genus of "antigen protein gene of human papilloma virus" would require excessive experimentation to identify proteins capable of eliciting the same protective immune response.

4. Claims 14-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The specification lacks complete deposit information for the deposit of plasmid pHCE2LB:pgsBCA-HPVE7 and transformant KCTC 10520BP, it is not clear that host cells possessing the identical properties of plasmid pHCE2LB:pgsBCA-HPVE7 and transformant KCTC 10520BP are known and publicly available or can be reproducibly isolated from nature without undue experimentation.

Exact replication of a host cell is an unpredictable event. Although applicant has provided a written description of a method for selecting the claimed cell, this method will not necessarily reproduce host cells which are chemically and structurally identical to those claimed. Undue experimentation would be required to screen all of the possible species to obtain the claimed host cells.

Because one skilled in the art could not be assured of the ability to practice the invention as claimed in the absence of the availability of the KCTC 10520BP host cells a suitable deposit for patent purposes, evidence of public availability of the KCTC 10520BP host cells or evidence of the reproducibility without undue experimentation is required.

If the deposit has been made under the provisions of the Budapest Treaty, filing of an affidavit or declaration by applicant or assignees or a statement by an attorney of record who has authority and control over the conditions of deposit over his or her signature and registration number stating that the deposit has been accepted by an International Depository Authority

under the provisions of the Budapest Treaty, that all restrictions upon public access to the deposit will be irrevocably removed upon the grant of a patent on this application and that the deposit will be replaced if viable samples cannot be dispensed by the depository is required. This requirement is necessary when deposits are made under the provisions of the Budapest Treaty as the Treaty leaves this specific matter to the discretion of each State. Amendment of the specification to recite the date of deposit and the complete name and full street address of the depository is required. As a possible means for completing the record, applicant may submit a copy of the contract with the depository for deposit and maintenance of each deposit.

If the deposits have not been made under the provisions of the Budapest Treaty, then in order to certify that the deposits comply with the criteria set forth in 37 CFR §1.801-1.809, assurances regarding availability and permanency of deposits are required. Such assurance may be in the form of an affidavit or declaration by applicants or assignees or in the form of a statement by an attorney of record who has the authority and control over the conditions of deposit over his or her signature and registration number averring:

(a) during the pendency of this application, access to the deposits will be afforded to the Commissioner upon request;

(b) all restrictions upon the availability to the public of the deposited biological material will be irrevocably removed upon the granting of a patent on this application;

(c) the deposits will be maintained in a public depository for a period of at least thirty years from the date of deposit or for the enforceable life of the patent or for a period of five years after the date of the most recent request for the furnishing of a sample of the deposited biological material, whichever is longest; and

(d) the deposits will be replaced if they should become nonviable or non-replicable.

In addition, a deposit of biological material that is capable of self-replication either directly or indirectly must be viable at the time of deposit and during the term of deposit. Viability may be tested by the depository. The test must conclude only that the deposited material is capable of reproduction. A viability statement for each deposit of a biological material not made under the Budapest Treaty must be filed in the application and must contain:

- 1) The name and address of the depository;
- 2) The name and address of the depositor;
- 3) The date of deposit;
- 4) The identity of the deposit and the accession number given by the depository;
- 5) The date of the viability test;
- 6) The procedures used to obtain a sample if the test is not done by the depository; and
- 7) A statement that the deposit is capable of reproduction.

As a possible means for completing the record, applicant may submit a copy of the contract with the depository for deposit and maintenance of each deposit.

If the deposit was made after the effective filing date of the application for patent in the United States, a verified statement is required from a person in a position to corroborate that the cell line described in the specification as filed is the same as that deposited in the depository. Corroboration may take the form of a showing of a chain of custody from applicant to the depository coupled with corroboration that the deposit is identical to the biological material described in the specification and in the applicant's possession at the time the application was filed.

Applicant's attention is directed to In re Lundack, 773 F.2d. 1216, 227 USPQ 90 (CAFC 1985) and 37 CFR §1.801-1.809 for further information concerning deposit practice.

Claim 3 is objected to for depending upon a rejected base claim, however claim 3 would be allowable if written in independent form.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Navarro whose telephone number is (571) 272-0861.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shannon Foley can be reached on (571) 272-0864. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Mark Navarro
Primary Examiner
December 5, 2007